DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 958 HE 009 863

AUTHOR Sidar, Alexander G., Jr.; Potter, David A.
TITLE No-Need/Merit Awards. A Survey of Their Use at Four-Year Public and Private Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 25p.
AVAILABLE FROM College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Financial Support; *Grants; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Questionnaires; *Scholarships; *School Surveys; *Student Financial Aid; *Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Results of a survey of the use of no-need/merit awards (grants, scholarships, and tuition remissions) at 398 higher education institutions are presented. The study sought answers to six questions: (1) What is the extent of use of no-need awards? (2) Has there been any tendency for the extent of use of no-need awards to change over time? (3) For what purposes are these awards used? (4) To what extent are the awards seen as successful in achieving these purposes? (5) What are the sources of funds for no-need awards? (6) To what extent does the use of no-need awards alter the amount of financial aid available to needy students? The appendix contains a copy of the no-need/merit awards questionnaire sent to the institutions. (Author/SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155958

No-Need / Merit Awards

A Survey of Their Use at Four-Year Public and Private Colleges and Universities

Alexander G. Sidar, Jr.
Executive Director
College Scholarship Service

David A. Potter
Research Psychologist
Educational Testing Service

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CEEB
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IHE 019 863

College Entrance Examination Board New York 19

Copies of this booklet can be ordered from College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The price is $2.

Copyright © 1978 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

Contents

CSS no-need/merit awards study committee v

Introduction 1

Background 3

The study 5

Summary 12

Conclusion 13

Appendix: No-need/merit awards questionnaire 14

CSS no-need/merit awards study committee

Warner Chapman
Professor of Government, and
Director of the Honors Division
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Jack B. Critchfield
President
Rollins College
Winter Park, Florida

William F. Elliot
Vice Provost
Enrollment Plan
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

William M. Geer
Director of Student Aid
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Elizabeth Vermey
Director of Admissions
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

Constance L. White
Director of Undergraduate
Financial Aid
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Introduction

The issue of the use of no-need/merit awards is a thorny one. The pros and cons of the use of these kinds of awards have been debated at College Board regional meetings, on the floor of the College Scholarship Service Assembly annual meetings, at National Association of College Admissions Counselors annual and state meetings, and on the campuses of our institutions. It is the aim of this report to place in the hands of college administrators objective data about the extent of use of these awards, their purposes, their costs, and the sources of funds used in these programs.

The data presented, unfortunately, do not permit a sound evaluation of the effectiveness of this procedure of awarding aid. To accomplish this, an in-depth study including personal interviews with students would be necessary. However, in the absence of hard aggregate data on the fulfillment or unfulfillment of institutional objectives in the use of no-need/merit awards it would appear to be prudent for institutions offering no-need awards to carefully evaluate their effectiveness in relation to funds expended.

Alexander G. Sidar, Jr.

Background

The purpose of financial aid awards, particularly grant monies, has been interpreted differently among academic institutions through the years. Two of the major purposes have been to aid needy and deserving students in the attainment of their educational objectives and to reward academic achievement. The rewarding of academic achievement is extremely attractive to faculties while the awarding of funds on the basis of need is endowed with societal virtue. Unfortunately, even with over 12 billion dollars available in a variety of aid programs for postsecondary education for students, the funds are not yet adequate to meet the requirements of all needy students. This was true in 1954, and the situation continues in 1978.

The College Scholarship Service (CSS) was initiated as an activity of the College Board in 1954 at the request of a group of College Board member institutions that had as one of its goals the reduction of unnecessary expenditures of institutional aid dollars being granted to students who did not need these funds. The creation of CSS contributed greatly to a movement by institutions to the widespread use of need as the primary criterion in the awarding of student aid. Another objective of the College Scholarship Service and its founding constituency was to permit students to choose an educational institution on the basis of its academic suitability rather than as a result of the amount of aid proffered.

Increasing the availability of aid funds to needy students and permitting student choice of an institution without the artificial pressure of financial inducements have been but two of CSS's contributions to greater equity in the use of student aid funds. However, it was these two important contributions that led to the growth of need as a criterion for awarding student aid funds through the late 1950s, 60s, and 70s.

CSS has helped promulgate professional standards and ethical procedures in student aid through endorsement by its membership of a series of Student Financial Aid Principles and Practices. These guidelines for ethical procedures encourage institutions to support the principle of distributing aid funds on the basis of need. Because of this the CSS has been viewed as the national leader in the effort to have limited funds distributed equitably to needy students.

As the competition among students for admission to college began to decline in the late 1960s and early 1970s some colleges that had been awarding all of their aid, or most of it, on the basis of need began to turn to no-need awards or to expand existing programs. One of the principle objectives was to maintain academic credential levels of the entering student classes similar to those high-water competitive levels of the early 1960s. Another was to maintain entering class size, again an attempt to hold to enrollments of the 60s. A third was to compete with lower-cost public institutions by discounting the cost of attendance for certain categories of academically superior high school students from middle-income families. In all cases no-need/

merit awards were adopted by growing numbers of institutions to accomplish one, two, or all three of these objectives. Their use appeared to be growing. CSS was asked to take a position by issuing a policy statement.

An ERIC search of data in this area revealed that little has been published and only one survey of this procedure had been accomplished. Robert P. Huff, Director of Financial Aid at Stanford University and former CSS Assembly Chairman, conducted a CSS-supported survey in 1974 of the use of no-need scholarships by institutions. The results of the survey, "No-Need Scholarships / What 859 Colleges Said about Granting Money to Students without Regard to Financial Need," were published in the spring 1975 *College Board Review*, number 91. Alexander G. Sidar, Jr., Executive Director of CSS, prepared a discussion paper on this topic for the 1976 College Board regional meetings. A modification of this paper was published in the fall 1976 issue of *The National ACAC Journal*, volume 21, number 2.

In that same *National ACAC Journal* issue, Joseph Y. Ruth of George Washington University presented an article supporting no-need/merit awards.

Richard W. Haines of Lafayette College presented a position paper to the Pennsylvania ACAC opposing no-need/merit awards. Rather than presenting a policy statement in the absence of further data on the issue, the CSS decided to undertake a study of the use of no-need/merit awards.

Huff's results, which are summarized in Table 1, show clearly that no-need/merit awards were in widespread use throughout the country in 1975. Huff sent questionnaires to 1,878 institutions and had a response rate of 45.7%. Of the 859 institutions responding to his questionnaire, 467 stated that they were at that time awarding no-need scholarships. Forty others replied that they were considering such awards.

Table 1: Results of Huff's merit awards survey (1975)

		Institutions making merit awards				
Category	Number of respondents	Number	Percent within category	Average amount of award	Institutions not making merit awards	Institutions considering merit awards
Public	265	143	55.9%	$669	113	9
Private	594	324	54.5	496	239	31
Small (to 5,000)	655	352	53.7	623	274	29
Medium (5,000–15,000)	102	59	57.8	571	37	6
Large (over 15,000)	102	56	54.9	618	41	5
East	295	115	39.0	746	162	18
South	156	104	66.7	676	48	4
Midwest	270	180	66.7	509	82	8
West	130	65	50.0	567	55	10
Other	8	3	37.5		5	0
Total	859	467	54.4%	$610	352	40

These data are interesting and revealing of the dimensions of the swing to no-need/merit awards by institutions. The issue was proved to be real, and discussion on both sides continued.

At the September 1976 meeting of the CSS Council the following resolution was passed:

RESOLVED: That the College Scholarship Service conduct a study in the winter and spring of 1976–77 on the use of no-need awards by postsecondary educational institutions. The study should encompass identification of the characteristics of no-need awards and their recipient populations, the extent of use, the institutional rationale in using such awards, and other aspects of this issue determined to be pertinent. To the degree permitted by time and funds, primary emphasis is to be placed upon the study of no-need scholarships and grants, but other forms of assistance may be included where necessary and practicable.

The study

Because of the importance of this issue to the financial aid process and the absence of information about institutional objectives in using no-need awards and institutional success in accomplishing these objective, this CSS study was conducted with the support of a grant from the Exxon Foundation. The extent of the study has been limited to grants, scholarships, and tuition remissions because of fund and time limitations.

The study sought answers to six basic questions:

1. What is the extent of use of no-need awards?
2. Has there been any tendency for the extent of use of no-need awards to change over time?
3. For what purposes are these awards used?
4. To what extent are the awards seen as successful in achieving these purposes?
5. What are the sources of funds for no-need awards?
6. To what extent does the use of no-need awards alter the amount of financial aid available to needy students?

Method

Sample

Questionnaires were initially sent to all 940 four-year-college CSS member institutions. Of these, 398 (42.3%) ultimately responded, a response rate close to Huff's 45.7%. No data were received that would help to determine whether or not the responding institutions differed from those that did not respond in any way that might bias the results obtained. Of the 398 institutions responding to the questionnaire, 116 (29.1%) indicated they were public institutions, 176 (44.2%) were private, and 104 (26.3%) were church-related. Two did not identify their affiliation.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire used (see the appendix) was designed to elicit several pertinent aspects and dimensions of no-need/merit awards. A draft of this questionnaire was tested in nine institutions in order to refine item content and wording. This pilot test involved telephone interviews with the financial aid officer filling out the questionnaire during which each item and each response to the item were examined carefully. The results of this pilot study were used by the CSS No-Need/Merit Awards Study Committee to make final revisions in the questionnaire. Institutions were asked if they are currently using no-need/merit awards. These were defined as:

> A monetary grant or scholarship given to a student on the basis of academic ability without reference to the student's need for the funds to attend the institution.

If an institution did not use these awards, several questions about their philosophy or reasons for eschewing this procedure were asked. Those who were using these awards were asked to respond to the entire questionnaire.

Procedure

A preliminary letter alerting chief executive officers to the study and its purposes and requesting cooperation of institutions in completing the questionnaire was sent by Sidney P. Marland, Jr., President of the College Board, to all 940 CSS Assembly four-year public and private member institutions. Ten days later the questionnaires, full instructions, and a postage-paid reply envelope were mailed to all institutions in the sample. Two weeks later follow-up mailgrams were sent to all institutions that had not yet responded. After four weeks additional time for receipt of completed questionnaires, the data received were keypunched and analyzed at Educational Testing Service. The Advisory Committee met in June 1977, reviewed the data, and requested that additional computer runs be accomplished in order to clarify some data, particularly that pertaining to tuition remission grants. An arbitrary decision had to be made to eliminate all institutions at which awards reported as tuition remissions exceeded 75% of the total no-need award budget. The committee also requested that where possible, comparison should be made with the Huff study. Final data were then produced for the study.

Results

Extent of use of no-need/merit awards

Of the 398 institutions responding to the questionnaire, 71% said that they were currently granting no-need/merit awards. This represents a sharp increase over the 54.4% figure obtained by Huff (1975). Because Huff's report did not address the issue of tuition remissions and tuition exchanges, we considered the possibility that the difference in our results was due to the inclusion of tuition remissions in the no-need/merit award data and eliminated from the CSS analysis all institutions (27) where tuition remissions constituted more than 75% of the no-need budget. After doing this, we found that 63.8% of our responding schools granted no-need awards.

There are good arguments both for including and for eliminating tuition remissions in the discussion of no-need awards. In order to ensure that our findings were not distorted by the inclusion of tuition remissions (which are not mentioned in Huff's study and are so often a part of the general faculty-staff fringe-benefit package rather than a part of the financial aid officer's funds), the following data reported are based on the 281 institutions that granted no-need awards and at which tuition remissions made up less than 75% of the no-need budget. Huff (1975) reported that the range in size of no-need/merit awards to individual students was from $25 per year to $4,500 per year; the comparable figures for the CSS study are $100 to $6,000 per year. However, it is more meaningful to observe that the range of average sizes of no-need awards is from $106 to $1,606. The ranges of averages for the three categories of institutions in this study are $41 to $1,351 for public institutions, $204 to $1,880 for private, and $28 to $1,458 for church-related. Comparisons of some of our findings with those obtained by Huff are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Comparison of results of the 1977 CSS study with results reported by Huff in 1975

	Huff's study (1975)			CSS study (1977)		
Category	Number making merit awards	Percent within category	Average amount of award	Number making merit awards	Percent within category	Average amount of award
Public	143	55.9	$669	74	64.3	$ 656
Private	324	54.5	496	122	69.3	1,188
Church	—	—	—	85	82.5	921
Small	352	53.7	623	225	71.2	979
Medium	59	57.8	571	46	69.7	965
Large	56	54.9	618	10	83.3	775
East	115	39.0	746	88	55.0	1,210
South	104	66.7	676	60	84.5	912
Midwest	180	66.7	509	79	84.9	912
West	65	50.0	567	54	75.0	731
Other	3	37.5	—	—	—	—
Total	467	54.4	$616	281	70.6	$ 971

Tendency for the extent of use of no-need/merit awards to change over time

Increases in amounts of funds directed to no-need/merit awards have been a clear and consistent trend over the years as shown in Table 3. It is highlighted by the fact that in the 1965–66 academic year the average institution in our sample group spent $34,756 on 58.9 no-need awards as compared to $160,975 for 197.6 awards in 1976–77. Although the monetary ratio of no-need to need based awards has remained consistent, the average size of awards has increased from $616 to $971.

Table 3: Trends in the use of no-need/merit awards: 1965 to 1977

Academic year	No-need/merit awards		Need-based awards		Monetary ratio*
	Average amount allocated per institution	Average number of awards per institution	Average amount allocated per institution	Average number of awards per institution	
1965–66	$ 34,756	58.9	$141,208	205.4	.196
1968–69	51,415	82.0	211,725	292.7	.195
1971–72	83,075	123.1	350,423	419.3	.192
1974–75	128,549	180.8	437,948	509.6	.226
1976–77	160,975	19[illegible].6	624,186	579.7	.205

*The monetary ratio equals the number of dollars allocated to no-need awards divided by the total number of dollars allocated to both no-need and need-based awards.

Types of no-need awards and their uses

One of the purposes of the study was to identify the kinds and the extent of use of institutional awards that do not have need as a criterion. Tables 4 and 5 indicate that there are a number of bases for awards. To reward academic achievement is the primary purpose. Tuition remissions and athletic awards are the second and third most common bases for no-need awards. However, as Table 5 shows, the average dollar expenditures per institution for athletics and tuition remissions are higher than those for academic awards.

Table 4: Average numbers of no-need/merit awards, tuition remissions, and tuition exchange stipends per institution

Basis of award	Level of students			
	Entering freshmen	Continuing upperclass	Transfer upperclass	Total
Academic	33.22	55.68	4.67	95.43
Music (including band)	4.51	9.99	0.67	18.44
Athletic	8.83	24.59	1.83	39.50
Newspaper	0.05	0.65	0.01	0.81
Other skills	6.27	12.24	0.59	21.97
Tuition remissions	17.54	51.34	6.70	80.92
Tuition exchange programs	0.31	0.86	0.05	1.40

Table 5: Average dollar expenditures per institution for no-need/merit awards and tuition remission and exchange programs by basis of award and level of recipients

Basis of award	Level of students			
	Entering freshmen	Continuing upperclass	Transfer upperclass	Total
Academic	$22,096	$ 40,122	$ 5,065	$ 57,676
Music (including band)	2,578	6,342	576	6,096
Athletic	21,231	62,669	3,958	63,256
Newspaper	43	1,059	0	1,365
Other skills	4,307	10,192	212	8,575
Tuition remissions	23,037	57,380	3,468	64,808
Tuition exchange programs	1,290	3,657	307	3,032
Total	$57,102	$139,808	$11,220	$168,115

Given the widespread and growing use of no-need awards, it is hardly surprising that institutions have a variety of reasons for their use. Our data indicate that the primary reason for the use of no-need awards is to increase the quality of the student body, and that this is done in competition not with lower-cost, publicly supported schools, but with other similar institutions. These data are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Purposes for which no-need awards are used

Objective	Not applicable	Some importance	Moderate importance	High importance
Increase number of students	69 26.4%	63 24.1%	63 24.1%	66 25.3%
Increase quality of students	24 9.0%	16 6.0%	42 15.7%	186 69.4%
Compete with other similar institutions	49 18.7%	49 18.7%	88 33.6%	76 29.0%
Compete with lower-cost, publicly supported schools	112 43.1%	47 18.1%	52 20.0%	49 18.8%
Other objectives	36 34.6%	4 3.8%	10 9.6%	54 51.9%

Implicit in our data is another reason for the use of no-need awards: other institutions are using them. Of the institutions reporting that at least some of their traditional competitors had instituted no-need/merit awards, 82.6% said that they themselves had such awards. In contrast, only 29% of those whose traditional competitors did not have no-need programs used such awards.

Extent to which no-need/merit awards are seen as successful in achieving their purposes

Only 17.7% of the responding institutions indicated that they had done any systematic studies of those who accepted or refused no-need awards. A total of 25% of the responding institutions had in some way determined whether or not students had changed their choice of institution because of these awards; of these, 74.2% said that students had been influenced by the awards. (It is also interesting to note that only 8.7% said that they had modified their awards strategy as a result of these studies.)

Sources of funds for no-need/merit awards

Table 7 shows that the sources of funds vary considerably depending on the location, size, and type of institution. Clearly, however, the largest single source of money for no-need awards is institutional operating funds. Furthermore, this source is relied upon most heavily by those who are presumably the least able to afford it—the small, church-related schools.

Table 7: Sources of funds for no-need awards

Category	Restricted endowment	Unrestricted endowment	Institutional operating funds*	Specifically designated gift	Other
Public	12.77%	7.94%	41.68%	24.38%	13.15%
Private	16.37	7.95	61.16	11.87	2.64
Church	9.40	6.43	78.19	5.27	0.09
Small	14.65	8.08	63.34	10.90	2.83
Medium	8.02	6.55	43.50	26.85	14.87
Large	16.45	4.38	48.00	25.25	7.13
East	13.14	5.03	71.73	7.03	2.89
South	16.60	9.15	46.71	20.16	6.97
Midwest	14.37	9.12	63.21	7.89	5.06
West	7.71	7.27	49.32	28.32	7.23
Total	13.31%	7.41%	60.24%	13.76%	5.18%

*Including tuition remissions

Extent to which the use of no-need/merit awards alters the amount of financial aid available to needy students

The use of no-need/merit awards seems to have little if any effect on the number of students admitted with unmet need. The vast majority (91%) of the institutions in our sample indicated that it was their policy to admit needy students to whom they offered partial assistance or no financial assistance; more important, use or non-use of no-need/merit awards had no relationship to the percentage of admitted aid applicants with unmet financial need. In schools granting no-need awards, 16.31% of admitted aid applicants had unmet financial need; for schools without no-need/merit awards, the corresponding figure was 16.7%. It cannot be determined from the data what the difference is in the amount of aid available to needy students.

Complicating the efforts to predict the future of these awards, however, is what might be termed a consistency effect: those financial aid officers whose institutions grant no-need awards tend to be more favorable toward the practice than are those whose schools do not grant such awards. In response to the question, "If the total amount of your institution's gift aid for next year were to be magically increased by 50%, what percentage of the additional money would you like to allocate to no-need/merit awards and what percentage to need-based awards," we obtained the data in Table 8.

Table 8: Institutional preferences in allocation of aid awards

	Institutions granting no-need awards	Institutions not granting no-need awards	All institutions
Preferred percentage of funds allocated to no-need/merit awards	22.2%	7.9%	19.5%
Preferred percentage of funds allocated to need-based awards	70.7%	84.9%	80.5%

The consistency effect is further demonstrated in Table 9 by institutional responses to the question, "If you could change the way your institution's award funds are currently allocated, would you prefer to . . . ."

Table 9: Institutional preferences in allocation of no-need awards

	Institutions granting no-need awards		Institutions not granting no-need awards	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Increase significantly the proportion of funds allocated to no-need awards	19	7%	2	2%
Increase somewhat the proportion allocated to no-need awards	63	23	11	11
Make no change	119	44	84	87
Decrease somewhat the proportion allocated to no-need awards	35	13	—	—
Decrease significantly the proportion allocated to no-need awards	35	13	—	—

Summary

The six basic questions addressed by the study may be answered as follows:

1. The extent and use of no-need/merit awards is more pervasive in 1977 than it was in 1975. 54.4% of the respondents in Huff's 1975 study reported the use of no-need/merit awards. 63.8% of the CSS respondents reported such use (excluding tuition remissions and tuition exchange programs).
2. The number of institutions turning to awards of this kind is increasing, and the range of stipends has moved from $25 to $4,500 per year in 1975 to $100 to $6,000 per year in 1977. This may reflect an increase in average total costs at four-year private colleges of $600 and at four-year public colleges of $400 from 1974-75 to 1976-77.
3. These awards appear to have the primary purpose of attracting students who are highly qualified academically. The highest average number of awards reported by respondents (over 95) were granted primarily on the basis of academic performance. Tuition remissions and athletic excellence follow as criteria for awards.
4. The success of these awards in achieving their purpose cannot readily be determined. Only 17.7% of those institutions in the study have done any systematic assessment of those accepting or refusing awards.
5. The sources of funds for no-need/merit type awards are predominately institutional. At public, private, and church-related schools, institutional operating funds are the chief source. When these are coupled with unrestricted and restricted endowments, it is readily apparent that institutional funds of one kind or another are the primary source of subsidization of these awards. Gifts specifically designated for programs of this kind are a lesser source of funding.
6. The percentages of students with unmet financial need accepted by institutions awarding and those not awarding no-need/merit grants have been determined in the study to be similar: 16.31% and 16.70%. However, any change in the actual amount of aid available to needy admitted students cannot be determined by the data available. The study did not elicit data on the number of admitted students with unmet need who actually registered or who opted for other colleges because of inadequate support resources at reporting institutions.

Additional observations that can be made from the study are:

The average amounts of awards are increasing more significantly at private and church-related institutions and at smaller institutions.

Other than tuition remissions, the amount of funds expended for academic awards is surpassed only by funds expended for athletic grants.

If given more funds to use freely, institutions would choose to delegate a significantly larger percentage of the monies to need-based awards than to no-need/merit awards.

If given a choice in allocation of existing funds to no-need and need-based awards, a significantly large number of institutions would choose to continue their present practices whether they grant no-need awards or hold to need as a criterion.

Conclusion

The intent of this study is to present objective data on the use of no-need/merit awards. Perhaps one of the most signficant disclosures from these data is that many institutions during the past few years have initiated or increased their use of no-need awards without providing for any plan or method of assessing their effectiveness. Most institutions responding to the questionnaire are expending a substantial amount of institutional funds, and it would appear to be important for institutions to undertake studies of the effectiveness of these programs.

A further issue inherent in these programs is that of the source of funds used to subsidize students who do not need funds to complete their academic objectives. When institutional funds are used, the sources of subsidies are the tuitions of other students, potential faculty and staff salary increases, and possible deferral of campus improvement and maintenance. Few of our educational institutions would endorse or enter into other procedures or programs that possess similar societal and institutional implications without preparing for a careful evaluative study of the results.

If the information presented here encourages institutions to assess the cost of these awards in relation to their effectiveness and to carefully evaluate the use of institutional funds as the monetary sources of these subsidies, this study will have achieved a major purpose.

Appendix:
No-need/merit awards questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS

Please note that we are interested primarily in learning about what you do with those financial aid funds which are under institutional control (i.e., you choose the recipients and designate amounts). In other words, what proportion of your aid budget goes to meet the need of students who would otherwise be unable to afford to attend your institution, and how much is used as an incentive to attract more or better students, even if they do not have a need for financial assistance?

In other words, except for those items which specifically ask about your total gift aid budget including those funds not under institutional control, please consider only those funds which ARE under institutional control. And if in doubt, please answer the question, noting in the margin or elsewhere on the page the basis you used for responding.

DEFINITIONS:

No-Need/Merit Awards: Monetary grants or scholarships given to a student who might be able to attend the institution without this subsidy. Need is not a consideration, and the award has no intentional relationship to the student's requirement for funds. Examples of terms by which such awards have been known are: merit grants, honor scholarships, and enrollment discounts. Discounting procedures in which students are granted differing tuition reductions on the basis of secondary school academic performance and/or test scores also fall into this category.

Tuition Remission: Discounting procedures in which students are granted full or partial tuition reductions without consideration of financial need. As used in this questionnaire on pages 1 and 2, the category includes only those awards in which neither need nor academic performance is considered in granting the award (e.g., tuition remissions granted children of faculty members). Tuition reductions based on academic qualifications (but not on need) should be counted with other awards (e.g., scholarships) in responding to the questionnaire.

PURELY PRACTICAL PROBLEMS:

For the multiple-choice items, please CIRCLE THE LETTER preceding your choice. For those few items on which more than one of the responses applies, please circle each of the appropriate alternatives.

IF NONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES SEEMS ADEQUATE, please circle the one which seems closest. In such cases, however, we should greatly appreciate it if you would also use either the space provided for comments or the back of the page to tell us whatever the item did not allow you to express adequately.

COMMENTS: Many items are followed by space for your comments. Please do not feel either compelled or restricted by this space -- compelled to say something, or restricted by the available space to say only part of what you think we ought to know (use the back of the page to continue, or attach more pages if necessary). All comments will be carefully read and considered; we know (and regret) that questionnaires are by their very nature somewhat restrictive, and hope that you will use the comments sections to overcome these restrictions.

A. Is your institution currently granting no-need/merit awards?

a. Yes
b. No

If your answer is "No," please go to Section E on page 9; if you answered "Yes," please continue and complete the entire questionnaire, including Section E.

B. Characteristics of no-need/merit awards

1. How many no-need/merit awards is your institution making per year to students in each of the following categories?

Basis of Award	Level of Students: ENTERING FRESHMEN	CONTINUING UPPERCLASS	TRANSFER UPPERCLASS
Purely academic	____	____	____
Music (incl. band)	____	____	____
Athletic	____	____	____
Newspaper	____	____	____
Tuition remissions	____	____	____
Tuition exchange programs	____	____	____
Other*	____	____	____

* Please describe these "Other" awards in the space below.

2. During the current (1976-77) academic year, how much is your institution spending for no-need/merit awards in each of the following categories?

Basis of Award	Level of Students: ENTERING FRESHMEN	CONTINUING UPPERCLASS	TRANSFER UPPERCLASS
Academic	$_____	$_____	$_____
Music (incl. band)	$_____	$_____	$_____
Athletic	$_____	$_____	$_____
Newspaper	$_____	$_____	$_____
Tuition remissions	$_____	$_____	$_____
Tuition exchange programs	$_____	$_____	$_____
Other skill-based awards*	$_____	$_____	$_____
TOTAL	$_____	$_____	$_____

* Please describe these other skill-based awards in the space below

3. What are the stipend ranges of these awards?

From $_____ to $_____

4. Including funds from all sources, regardless of whether or not their disbursement is under the control of your institution, what is your total institutional gift aid budget for the current academic year?

$_____

5. Of this, what is the total amount of gift aid which is under institutional control (i.e., you choose recipients and designate amounts)?

$_____

6. For what period are your no-need/merit awards granted (circle as many as apply to your institution):

a. A one year period, nonrenewable
b. One year, renewable
c. The full undergraduate program
d. Other _____

7. For each of the following academic years, please list (a) the amount of money granted by your institution for both need-based and no-need/merit awards, and (b) the number of these awards given during each year:

ACADEMIC YEAR	NO-NEED/MERIT AWARDS		NEED-BASED AWARDS	
	Amount	Number	Amount	Number
1965-66	$_____	_____	$_____	_____
1968-69	$_____	_____	$_____	_____
1971-72	$_____	_____	$_____	_____
1974-75	$_____	_____	$_____	_____
1976-77	$_____	_____	$_____	_____

C. Recipient populations

1. What are the academic qualifications that students must demonstrate in order to qualify for no-need/merit awards? Please remember to define the scale (e.g., 4.0, 3.0, letter grades) on which aid applicants are ranked.

2. Are these awards stratified in any way? That is, do students with differing academic credentials qualify for stipends of varying amounts?

a. Yes
b. No

3. If your answer to the preceding question was "yes," please explain how the awards are stratified.

4. Has the institution done any studies on those who accepted and those who did not accept these awards, and their reasons? (If yes, we would greatly appreciate receiving any available report(s).)

a. Yes
b. No

5. What conclusions have you drawn from this study?

6. Has the institution determined if students have changed their choice of institution because of these awards?

a. Yes
b. No

If yes, have they changed? Yes ____ No ____

7. Has your institution modified its awards strategy as a result of these studies?

a. Yes
b. No
c. We haven't performed any studies

If yes, in what way(s) have you modified your awards strategy?

D. Institutional Rationale

1. Following are some objectives in pursuit of which an institution might use no-need/merit awards. Please rate the extent to which each of the listed objectives is applicable to your institution -- i.e., to what extent is each of these factors a reason for your use of no-need/merit awards?

OBJECTIVE	N/A	SOME IMPORTANCE	MODERATE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE
Increase number of students	____	____	____	____
Increase quality of students	____	____	____	____
Compete with other similar institutions	____	____	____	____
Compete with lower-cost publicly supported schools	____	____	____	____
Other objectives (Describe below)	____	____	____	____

2. What percentage of your institution's no-need/merit award funds for this academic year come from each of the following sources:

a. Endowment (restricted) _____%

b. Endowment (unrestricted) _____%

c. Institutional operating funds (include tuition remission or discounts) _____%

d. Specifically designated gift _____%

e. Other sources (identify below) _____%

TOTAL 100%

E. Other Institutional Questions

1. Have any of your traditionally competitive institutions also instituted these awards?

a. Yes
b. No
c. Don't know

2. Have you had a no-need/merit program during the past ten years and discontinued it?

a. Yes
b. No
c. Yes, but there were very few such awards

3. If you have had a no-need/merit program and discontinued it, for what reasons was it discontinued? Choose as many as apply.

a. Financial (not enough funds available)
b. Program was ineffective in meeting its goals
c. Equality of Educational Opportunity - related reasons
d. Other

Comments:

4. If your institution does not currently grant no-need/merit awards, are you considering doing so?

a. Yes
b. No

What would be your reason(s) for instituting a no-need/merit awards program?

5. If you could change the way in which your institution's award funds are currently allocated, would you prefer to

a. Increase significantly the proportion allocated to no-need awards
b. Increase somewhat the proportion allocated to no-need awards
c. Make no change in the way in which award funds are allocated
d. Decrease somewhat the proportion allocated to no-need awards
e. Decrease significantly the proportion allocated to no-need awards

What would be your reason(s) for this decision?

6. If the total amount of your institution's gift aid for next year were to be magically increased by 50%, what percentage of the additional money would you like to allocate

a. To no-need merit awards: _____%
b. To need-based awards: _____%
(N.B.: These should total 100%)

What would be your reason(s) or goal(s)?

7. Do you admit any needy students to whom you cannot offer financial aid?

a. Yes, if they are qualified for admission
b. No, if we cannot offer a needy student financial aid we refuse admission
c. Other (explain)

8. What percent of admitted aid applicants have financial need which you do not meet?

_____%

9. In each of the last three academic years, did your institution meet its enrollment goals for:

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Entering freshmen	Yes____ No ____	Yes____ No ____	Yes____ No ____
Full-time undergraduates	Yes____ No ____	Yes____ No ____	Yes____ No ____

10. What percentage of your currently enrolled undergraduate students receives financial aid from any source whatsoever?

_____%

11. What do you think the future of no-need/merit awards is? What do you think it should be? (Continue on the back if necessary.)